

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
WESTERN DIVISION

---

BILLY LEWIS WALKER,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SHELBY COUNTY, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 11-2019-JDT-tmp

---

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL  
(DOCKET ENTRY 3)  
ORDER OF DISMISSAL  
ORDER CERTIFYING APPEAL NOT TAKEN IN GOOD FAITH  
AND  
ORDER DENYING LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS ON APPEAL

---

On January 6, 2011, Plaintiff Billy Lewis Walker, who at that time was confined as an inmate at the Shelby County Correction Center (“SCCC”) in Memphis, Tennessee, filed a pro se complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, along with a to proceed in forma pauperis. (Docket Entry (“D.E.”) 1, D.E. 2.) On January 11, 2011, the Court issued an order that granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis and assessed the civil filing fee. (D.E. 4.) The Clerk shall record the defendants as Shelby County,<sup>1</sup> Mark Luttrell, James Coleman, Patricia Booker, M.J. Love, and James Harris.

Plaintiff Walker alleges that he was serving a Shelby County sentence of imprisonment when he was taken to DeSoto County, Mississippi, to face trial on another charge. He contends that Defendants Booker and Love, Central Records Clerks, “gave [him] the sentence credits . . . [for the time spent in DeSoto County] . . . then took them away.” (D.E. 1 at 2, 4.) Walker alleges that

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff named the SCCC as a Defendant. Governmental departments, divisions, and buildings are not suable entities. Therefore, the Court construes those claims against Shelby County. See generally Hafer v. Melo, 502 U. S. 21 (1991).

Defendant Coleman is responsible as the supervisor of Love and Booker. He alleges that former Shelby County Mayor Mark Luttrell is responsible for actions taken by his subordinates. Plaintiff alleges that the SCCC is “directly liable as the institution” as Defendants’ employer and that Defendant Harris is responsible for obtaining information from Central Records. (*Id.* at 4.) Walker seeks restoration of the sentence credits and “any monetary amount that the Court sees fit.” (*Id.* at 3.)

The Court is required to screen prisoner complaints and to dismiss any complaint, or any portion thereof, if the complaint—

- (1) is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or
- (2) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.

28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b); see also 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

In assessing whether the complaint in this case states a claim on which relief may be granted, the standards under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6), as stated in Ashcroft v. Iqbal, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_, \_\_\_, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1949-50 (2009), and in Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555-57 (2007), are applied. Hill v. Lappin, 630 F.3d 468, 470-71 (6th Cir. 2010). “Accepting all well-pleaded allegations in the complaint as true, the Court ‘consider[s] the factual allegations in [the] complaint to determine if they plausibly suggest an entitlement to relief.’” Williams v. Curtin, 631 F.3d 380, 383 (6th Cir. 2011) (quoting Iqbal, 129 S. Ct. at 1951) (alteration in original). “[P]leadings that . . . are no more than conclusions are not entitled to the assumption of truth. While legal conclusions can provide the framework of a complaint, they must be supported by factual allegations.” Iqbal, 129 S. Ct. at 1950; see also Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555 n.3 (“Rule 8(a)(2) still requires a ‘showing,’ rather than a blanket assertion, of entitlement to relief. Without some factual allegation in the complaint, it is hard to see how a claimant could satisfy the requirement of providing not only ‘fair notice’ of the nature of the claim, but also ‘grounds’ on which the claim rests.”).

“A complaint can be frivolous either factually or legally. See Neitzke [v. Williams], 490 U.S. [319,] 325, 109 S. Ct. at 1827 [(1989)]. Any complaint that is legally frivolous would *ipso facto* fail to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. See id. at 328-29, 109 S. Ct. 1827.” Hill, 630 F.3d at 470.

Whether a complaint is factually frivolous under §§ 1915A(b)(1) and 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) is a separate issue from whether it fails to state a claim for relief. Statutes allowing a complaint to be dismissed as frivolous give “judges not only the authority to dismiss a claim based on an indisputably meritless legal theory, but also the unusual power to pierce the veil of the complaint’s factual allegations and dismiss those claims whose factual contentions are clearly baseless.” Neitzke, 490 U.S. at 327, 109 S. Ct. 1827 (interpreting 28 U.S.C. § 1915). Unlike a dismissal for failure to state a claim, where a judge must accept all factual allegations as true, Iqbal, 129 S. Ct. at 1949-50, a judge does not have to accept “fantastic or delusional” factual allegations as true in prisoner complaints that are reviewed for frivolousness. Neitzke, 490 U.S. at 327-28, 109 S. Ct. 1827.

Id. at 471.

“Pro se complaints are to be held ‘to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers,’ and should therefore be liberally construed.” Williams, 631 F.3d at 383 (quoting Martin v. Overton, 391 F.3d 710, 712 (6th Cir. 2004)). Pro se litigants and prisoners are not exempt from the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. As the Sixth Circuit has explained:

Before the recent onslaught of pro se prisoner suits, the Supreme Court suggested that pro se complaints are to be held to a less stringent standard than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. See Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 92 S. Ct. 594, 30 L. Ed. 2d 652 (1972) (per curiam). Neither that Court nor other courts, however, have been willing to abrogate basic pleading essentials in pro se suits. See, e.g., id. at 521, 92 S. Ct. at 596 (holding petitioner to standards of Conley v. Gibson); Merritt v. Faulkner, 697 F.2d 761 (7th Cir.) (duty to be less stringent with pro se complaint does not require court to conjure up unplead allegations), cert. denied, 464 U.S. 986, 104 S. Ct. 434, 78 L. Ed. 2d 3366 (1983); McDonald v. Hall, 610 F.2d 16 (1st Cir. 1979) (same); Jarrell v. Tisch, 656 F. Supp. 237 (D.D.C. 1987) (pro se plaintiffs should plead with requisite specificity so as to give defendants notice); Holsey v. Collins, 90 F.R.D. 122 (D. Md. 1981) (even pro se litigants must meet some minimum standards)).

Wells v. Brown, 891 F.2d 591, 594 (6th Cir. 1989); see also Brown v. Matauszak, No. 09-2259, 2011 WL 285251, at \*5 (6th Cir. Jan. 31, 2011) (affirming dismissal of pro se complaint for failure to comply with “unique pleading requirements” and stating “a court cannot ‘create a claim which [a plaintiff] has not spelled out in his pleading’”) (quoting Clark v. Nat'l Travelers Life Ins. Co., 518

F.2d 1167, 1169 (6th Cir. 1975)) (alteration in original); Payne v. Secretary of Treas., 73 F. App'x 836, 837 (6th Cir. 2003) (affirming sua sponte dismissal of complaint pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2) and stating, “[n]either this court nor the district court is required to create Payne's claim for her”); *cf. Pliler v. Ford*, 542 U.S. 225, 231 (2004) (“District judges have no obligation to act as counsel or paralegal to pro se litigants.”).

To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983,<sup>2</sup> a plaintiff must allege two elements: (1) a deprivation of rights secured by the “Constitution and laws” of the United States (2) committed by a defendant acting under color of state law. Adickes v. S.H. Kress & Co., 398 U.S. 144, 150 (1970).

Section 1983 will not support a claim based upon a theory of respondeat superior alone. Polk County v. Dodson, 454 U.S. 312, 325 (1981); Bellamy v. Bradley, 729 F.2d 416, 421 (6th Cir. 1984). A plaintiff must allege that a defendant official was personally involved in the unconstitutional activity of a subordinate in order to state a claim against such a defendant. Dunn v. State of Tennessee, 697 F.2d 121, 128 (6th Cir. 1982). A failure to supervise, control or train an individual is not actionable “unless the supervisor ‘either encouraged the specific incident of misconduct or in some other way directly participated in it.’” Shehee v. Luttrell, 199 F.3d 295, 300 (6th Cir. 1999). “At a minimum a plaintiff must show that the official least implicitly authorized, approved, or knowingly acquiesced in the unconstitutional conduct of the offending officers.” Hays v. Jefferson Co., Ky., 668 F.2d 869, 874 (6th Cir. 1982). It is clear that Plaintiff sues Defendants Luttrell and Coleman because of their supervisory capacities.

When a § 1983 claim is made against a municipality, the court must analyze two distinct issues: (1) whether plaintiff's harm was caused by a constitutional violation; and (2) if so, whether

---

<sup>2</sup> Section 1983 provides: Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress. For the purposes of this section, any Act of Congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a statute of the District of Columbia.

the municipality is responsible for that violation. Collins v. City of Harker Heights, Tex., 503 U.S. 115, 120 (1992). The Court will address the issues in reverse order.

A municipality “cannot be held liable solely because it employs a tortfeasor-or, in other words, a municipality cannot be held liable under § 1983 on a respondeat superior theory.” Monell v. Dep’t. of Soc. Serv., 436 U.S. 658, 691 (1978)(emphasis in original); Searcy v. City of Dayton, 38 F.3d 282, 286 (6th Cir. 1994); Berry v. City of Detroit, 25 F.3d 1342, 1345 (6th Cir. 1994). “[T]he touchstone of ‘official policy’ is designed ‘to distinguish acts of the municipality from acts of employees of the municipality, and thereby make clear that municipal liability is limited to action for which the municipality is actually responsible.’” City of St. Louis v. Praprotnik, 485 U.S. 112, 138 (1988) (quoting Pembaur v. Cincinnati, 475 U.S. 469, 479-480 (1986))(emphasis in original).

A municipality cannot be held responsible for a constitutional deprivation unless there is a direct causal link between a municipal policy or custom and the alleged constitutional deprivation. Monell, 436 U.S. at 691-92; Deaton v. Montgomery Co., Ohio, 989 F.2d 885, 889 (6th Cir. 1993). To demonstrate municipal liability, a plaintiff “must (1) identify the municipal policy or custom, (2) connect the policy to the municipality, and (3) show that his particular injury was incurred due to execution of that policy.” Alkire v. Irving, 330 F.3d 802, 815 (6th Cir. 2003) (citing Garner v. Memphis Police Dep’t, 8 F.3d 358, 364 (6th Cir. 1993)). “Where a government ‘custom has not received formal approval through the body’s official decisionmaking channels,’ such a custom may still be the subject of a § 1983 suit.” Alkire, 330 F.3d at 815 (quoting Monell, 436 U.S. at 690-91). The policy or custom “must be ‘the moving force of the constitutional violation’ in order to establish the liability of a government body under § 1983.” Searcy, 38 F.3d at 286 (quoting Polk Co., 454 U.S. at 326(citation omitted)).

In this case, Plaintiff has not alleged that Defendants Booker, Love, and Harris acted pursuant to a municipal policy or custom in causing his alleged harm, and nothing in the complaint demonstrates that action by those Defendants occurred as a result of a policy or custom implemented or endorsed by Shelby County. Consequently, the complaint fails to establish a basis of liability

against the municipality and fails to state a cognizable § 1983 claim against Shelby County. When a complaint fails to allege any action by a defendant, it necessarily fails to “state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face.” Bell Atlantic Corp., 550 U.S. at 570.

There is no right under the Constitution to earn sentence credits. Hansard v. Barrett, 980 F.2d 1059, 1062 (6th Cir. 1992). Neither is there any fundamental right under the Constitution to parole or early release. See Greenholtz v. Inmates of the Nebraska Penal and Correctional Complex, 442 U.S. 1, 11 (1979). Tennessee law and regulations do not create a right to parole, Wright v. Trammell, 810 F.2d 589, 591 (6th Cir. 1987), or to earn such credits. See Tenn. Code Ann. § 41-21-236(a)(2)(A) and (C)(2006).<sup>3</sup> Therefore, no Tennessee prisoner has a vested property or liberty interest in sentence reduction. Thus, the denial of that opportunity to Plaintiff does not implicate the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Thus, the Court DISMISSES the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) and 1915A(b)(1). Judgment shall be entered for Defendants. The motion for appointment of counsel (D.E. 3) is DENIED as MOOT.

The Court must also consider whether Plaintiff should be allowed to appeal this decision in forma pauperis, should he seek to do so. The United States Court of Appeals requires that all district courts in the circuit determine, in all cases where the appellant seeks to proceed in forma pauperis, whether the appeal is frivolous. Floyd v. United States Postal Serv., 105 F.3d 274, 277 (6th Cir.

---

<sup>3</sup> Each inmate who exhibits good institutional behavior or who exhibits satisfactory performance within a program may be awarded time credits toward the sentence imposed, varying between one (1) day and sixteen (16) days for each month served, with not more than eight (8) days for each month served for good institutional behavior and not more than eight (8) days for each month served for satisfactory program performance in accordance with the criteria established by the department. Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 41-21-236(a)(2)(A).

No inmate shall have the right to any such time credits, nor shall any inmate have the right to participate in any particular program, and may be transferred from one (1) assignment to another without cause. The provisions of this section shall also apply to any inmate sentenced to the department of correction who is being held on a contract basis by a private correctional corporation. Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 41-21-236(a)(2)(C).

1997). Twenty-eight U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) provides that “[a]n appeal may not be taken in forma pauperis if the trial court certifies in writing that it is not taken in good faith.”

The good faith standard is an objective one. Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962). An appeal is not taken in good faith if the issue presented is frivolous. Id. It would be inconsistent for a district court to determine that a complaint should be dismissed prior to service on the defendant, but has sufficient merit to support an appeal in forma pauperis. See Williams v. Kullman, 722 F.2d 1048, 1050 n.1 (2d Cir. 1983). The same considerations that lead the Court to dismiss this case for failure to state a claim also compel the conclusion that an appeal would not be taken in good faith.

It is therefore CERTIFIED, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that any appeal in this matter by Plaintiff would not be taken in good faith and Plaintiff may not proceed on appeal in forma pauperis.

The Sixth Circuit decisions in McGore v. Wrigglesworth, 114 F.3d 601 (6th Cir. 1997), and Floyd, 105 F.3d at 277, apply to any appeal filed by Plaintiff in this case. If Plaintiff files a notice of appeal, he must pay the entire \$455 filing fee required by 28 U.S.C. §§ 1913 and 1917.<sup>4</sup> The entire filing fee must be paid within thirty (30) days of the filing of the notice of appeal.

By filing a notice of appeal Plaintiff becomes liable for the full amount of the filing fee, regardless of the subsequent progress of the appeal. If Plaintiff fails to comply with the above assessment of the appellate filing fee within thirty (30) days<sup>5</sup> of the filing of the notice of appeal or

---

<sup>4</sup> The fee for docketing an appeal is \$450. See Judicial Conference Schedule of Fees, ¶ 1, Note following 28 U.S.C. § 1913. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1917, a district court also charges a \$5 fee:

Upon the filing of any separate or joint notice of appeal or application for appeal or upon the receipt of any order allowing, or notice of the allowance of, an appeal or of a writ of certiorari \$5 shall be paid to the clerk of the district court, by the appellant or petitioner.

<sup>5</sup> The district court may extend this deadline one time by thirty days  
(continued...)

the entry of this order, whichever occurs later, the district court will notify the Sixth Circuit, which will dismiss the appeal. If the appeal is dismissed, it will not be reinstated once the fee is paid. McGore, 114 F.3d at 610.

For analysis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) of future filings, if any, by Plaintiff, this is the first dismissal of one of his cases as frivolous or for failure to state a claim.<sup>6</sup> This “strike” shall take effect, without further action by the Court, upon expiration of the time for filing a notice of appeal, the dismissal of any appeal, or the affirmation of the district court’s ruling on appeal, whichever is later.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ James D. Todd  
JAMES D. TODD  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

(...continued)  
if the motion to extend is filed before the expiration of the original deadline.  
McGore, 114 F.3d at 610.

<sup>6</sup> Because Plaintiff was a prisoner when this case was filed, the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) are applicable. See Cox v. Mayer, 332 F.3d 422, 424-28 (6th Cir. 2003); see also Bowling v. Runion, No. 2:05-CV-313, 2006 WL 2251994, at \*1 n.1 (E.D. Tenn. Aug. 4, 2006).